LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

FILED
NOV 13 1970
E. ROBERT SEAVER, CLERK

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
October Term, 1970
No. 451

TILDEN W. JOHNSON,

Appellant,

vs.

STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA, a public corp., HUGH W. DARLING, SAMUEL C. PRUITT, JR., A. STEVENS HALSTED, JR., and HARVARD CLUB OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,

Appellees.

Petition for a Rehearing

TILDEN W. JOHNSON
5630 Sawtelle Boulevard
Culver City, California 90230
(213) 398-1605 or 388-7104

In Propria Persona

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
October Term, 1970
No. 451

TILDEN W. JOHNSON,

Appellant,

vs.

STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA, a public corp., HUGH W. DARLING, SAMUEL O. PRUITT, JR., A. STEVENS HALSTED, JR., and HARVARD CLUB OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,

Appellees.

Petition for a Rehearing

TILDEN W. JOHNSON
5630 Sawtelle Boulevard
Culver City, California 90230
(213) 398-1605 or 388-7104

In Propria Persona

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
October Term, 1970
No. 451

TILDEN W. JOHNSON,

Appellant,

vs.

STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA, a public corp., HUGH W. DARLING, SAMUEL O. PRUITT, JR., A STEVENS HALSTED, JR., and HARVARD CLUB OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,

Appellees.

Petition for a Rehearing

Petitioner prays that this court grant a rehearing and/or reconsideration of the order of October 19, 1970 that reads:

> "The appeal is dismissed for want of jurisdiction. Treating the papers whereon the appeal was taken as a petition for a writ of certiorari, certiorari is denied."

To petitioner the holding of want of jurisdiction clearly indicates the U. S. Supreme Court from the papers and record considers the Calif. State Judgment was a void judgment and that a new suit can be filed in California thereon and that therefore Calif. State Process has not been completed and that therefore no final judgment exists and that therefore the U. S. Supreme Court lacks jurisdiction to hear the appeal.

On the other hand the appellees contend the holding of want of jurisdiction Petition 451 Oct. Term, 1970 means that a judge and justices sitting and deciding a case (over objections) where they are parties to the action in violation of sec. 170 of the California Code of Civil Procedure; Tumey v. Ohio, 47 S. Ct. 437; Payne v. Lee, 222 Minn 269; prohibiting such conduct does not violate the due process and equal process of law of the U. S. Constitution's 14th Amendment, and that since no violation occurs the U. S. Supreme Court lacks jurisdiction. This appellee interpretation conflicts with Tumey case decision, and Payne case.

The actual records and facts in this case are worse than even the papers herein show. I. e., Bar Associations the past 50 years have served as mere branch office through which big name universities individually and in concert practiced law and public relations as de facto law firms utilizing alumni and drawing fees thru foundations paying for services rendered insurance companies, etc. and insurance companies paying attorneys for political action

for tax-exempt foundations, etc. Said Bar Assoc. all the while used a fraudulent mathematical calculation of bar grades (under rating exam. papers from 20 to 30%) by taking advantage of public befuddlement regarding correct calculation of grades involving meaning of terms of ratio, percentage, percent and base (see Pet. 434, Oct. Term, 1969), or State Bars figured erroneously without an Engineer's license to figure.

It is apparent if the appellees' contention of the meaning of the court's dismissal of appeal, lawfully before the U. S. Supreme Court by right, is correct, candidates running for political offices such as Senator and Congressmen will use the failure of the U. S. Supreme Court and Senators and Congressmen's failure to investigate as evidence of Congressional dereliction of duty and cite some startling conditions and figures in behalf of their candidacies.

What appears to be transpiring is that State Bars are so dominating bar admittees that none of them protest the debasement of legal principles by construction and application of laws 180 degrees from the way they read. Further since recent U. S. Supreme Court voting and integration of schools rulings based on constitutional rights, State Courts, as occured in the era of prohibition, are refusing to enforce federal or state constitutional provisions, just stating "take it to the U. S.

Supreme Court." This is making chaos and mockery of all law and breaks down tort law and causes the big crime wave as people take to violence when tort law is not enforced by states, in civil suits.

Therefore, it is urged the U.S. Supreme Court meet this situation by changing the brief language in which it now disposes of 90% of appeals to it, or adopt a practice in cases as here of noting probable jurisdiction and force the complained of party to brief the case and expose his weak position.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above and in the Jurisdictional statements in petition 451, Oct. Term, 1970 and premature petition 434 of Oct. Term, 1969, it is respectfully urged that the U.S. Supreme Court reconsider and in its decision enlarge the statement "Appeal is dismissed for want of jurisdiction" by specifying the grounds assumed causing want of jurisdiction, i.e., "Calif. judgment void; Calif. process requires new suit before state process completed, thus no final state judgment"; or other grounds for holding "want of jurisdiction," or that the Court note probable jurisdiction of appeal and certiorari forcing appellees to try to brief an opposition or prove the accuracy of their mathematical calculations and judges trying their own cases.

It is submitted it is better for the U.S. Supreme Court to fully investigate this matter than wait for political candidates to air a scandalous national condition that should have been investigated by Congress 30 years ago at least.

Respectfully submitted,

TILDEN W. JOHNSON

In Propria Persona

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify under penalty of perjury Sec. 2015.5 C.C.P. that the foregoing Petition for a rehearing and/or reconsideration is presented in good faith and not for delay and is restricted to grounds specified in Rule 58 of the Rules of this Court.

Signed in Los Angeles, California, Nov. 10, 1970.

Tilden W. Johnson
In Per Se